arXiv:1404.0573v1 [math.DS] 2 Apr 2014

MINIMAL RAYS ON SURFACES OF GENUS GREATER THAN ONE

JAN PHILIPP SCHRÖDER

Abstract. For Finsler metrics (no reversibility assumed) on closed orientable surfaces of genus greater than one, we study the dynamics of minimal rays and minimal geodesics in the universal cover. We prove in particular, that for almost all asymptotic directions the minimal rays with these directions laminate the universal cover and that the Busemann functions with these directions are unique up to adding constants. Moreover, using a kind of weak KAM theory, we show that for almost all types of minimal geodesics in the sense of Morse, there is precisely one minimal geodesic of this type.

1. Introduction and main results

We begin by fixing some notation. We assume throughout the paper that M is a closed orientable surface of genus > 1. On M, there exists a (hyperbolic) Riemannian metric g_h of constant curvature -1. The Riemannian universal cover of M, denoted by (X, g_h), is identified with the Poincaré disc model, i.e. $X = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$ and $(g_h)_z(v, w) = 4 \cdot (1 - |z|^2)^{-2} \langle v, w \rangle_{euc}$, where the geodesics $\gamma \subset X$ are circle segments meeting $S^1 = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = 1\}$ orthogonally. Let d_h be the distance function on X induced by g_h. We write $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{Iso}(X, g_h)$ for the group of deck transformations $\tau : X \to X$ with respect to the covering $X \to M$, which extend to naturally to the "boundary at infinity" S^1.

Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the set of all oriented, unparametrized geodesics $\gamma \subset X$ with respect to g_h. We can think of $\mathcal{G}$ as $S^1 \times S^1 - \mathrm{diag}$, associating to $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$ its pair of endpoints $(\gamma(-\infty), \gamma(\infty))$ on S^1. Moreover, set

$$\mathcal{G}_\pm(\xi) := \{\gamma \in \mathcal{G} : \gamma(\pm\infty) = \xi\}.$$

We consider any Finsler metric $F : TX \to \mathbb{R}$, which is assumed to be invariant under Γ (cf. Definition 2.1). We write $SX = \{F = 1\} \subset TX$ and $c_v : \mathbb{R} \to X$ for the geodesic with respect to F defined by $\dot{c}_v(0) = v$.

The main object of interest in this paper are rays and minimal geodesics, that is geodesics $c : [0, \infty) \to X$, $c : \mathbb{R} \to X$, respectively that minimize the length with respect to F between any of their points. In [Mor24], H. M. Morse studied the global behavior of minimal geodesics and showed that minimal geodesics lie in tubes around hyperbolic geodesics $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$ of finite

Key words and phrases. Finsler metrics, minimal geodesics, surface of higher genus, Busemann functions, weak KAM solutions.

width D, where D is a constant depending only on F and g_h. In particular, minimal geodesics $c : \mathbb{R} \to X$ have well-defined endpoints $c(\pm\infty)$ at infinity, i.e. on S^1; the analogous result holds for rays. For $\xi \in S^1, \gamma \in \mathcal{G}$ set

$$\mathcal{R}_+(\xi) := \{v \in SX \mid c_v : [0,\infty) \to X \text{ is a ray, } c(\infty) = \xi\},$$
$$\mathcal{M}(\gamma) := \{v \in SX \mid c_v : \mathbb{R} \to X \text{ is a minimal geodesic, } c(\pm\infty) = \gamma(\pm\infty)\}.$$

Morse studied in particular the behavior of minimal geodesics in $\mathcal{R}_+(\xi)$, where ξ is fixed under a non-trivial group element $\tau \in \Gamma$; we will recall these results in Subsection 4.1. However, Morse left open the finer structure in the asymptotic directions which are not fixed by an element of Γ and the author is not aware of any other work in the literature in this direction. The purpose of this paper is to fill this gap, i.e. to study the structure of $\mathcal{R}_+(\xi)$ for general $\xi \in S^1$. While we are still not able to give the structure for all ξ, we will be able to do it for "most" ξ.

Another novelty in this paper, compared to the work of Morse, is the use of Finsler instead of Riemannian metrics. It was observed by E. M. Zaustinsky [Zau62], that the results of Morse carry over to these much more general systems. Moreover, it is known that Finsler metrics can be used to describe the dynamics of arbitrary Tonelli Lagrangian systems in high energy levels, cf. [CIPP98].

The sets $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ are bounded by two particular minimal geodesics. The following lemma is Theorem 8 of [Mor24].

Lemma 1.1 (Bounding geodesics)**.** *for $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$, there are two particular non-intersecting, minimal geodesics c^0_γ, c^1_γ in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$, such that all minimal geodesics in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ lie in the strip in X bounded by c^0_γ, c^1_γ.*

As a rule, we will always assume that c^1_γ lies left of c^0_γ with respect to the orientation of γ.

We can now state our first result, saying that for most asymptotic directions $\xi \in S^1$, the bounding geodesics c^i_γ of the various $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$ do not intersect. The proof makes use of weak KAM theory, but does not rely on the group action by Γ. In fact, Theorem 1.2 and its Corollary 1.3 hold for any Finsler metric F on X, which is uniformly equivalent to the norm of g_h (cf. Definition 2.1).

Theorem 1.2. *For all but countably many $\xi \in S^1$, the set*

$$L(\xi) := \bigcup \{c^i_\gamma(\mathbb{R}) : \gamma \in \mathcal{G}_+(\xi), i = 0, 1\}$$

is a lamination of X (i.e. no curves in $L(\xi)$ intersect transversely).

It would be desirable to know if the set $L(\xi)$ is a lamination of X for all $\xi \in S^1$; we would then gain more insight in the structure of $\mathcal{R}_+(\xi)$ for all ξ, cf. Theorem 1.13 below.

From this we will deduce the following.

Corollary 1.3 (Uniqueness of minimal geodesics)**.** *For almost all $\gamma \in \mathcal{G} \cong S^1 \times S^1 - \mathrm{diag}$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure, the set $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ consists of precisely one minimal geodesic.*

For the statement of our next results, we need the following definitions.

Definition 1.4. *A minimal ray $c : [0, \infty) \to X$ is called* forward unstable*, if there is no minimal ray $c' : [0, \infty) \to X$ with $c'(0) \in c(0, \infty)$ and $c'(\infty) = c(\infty)$, which is not a subray of c.*

Remark 1.5.
- Instability of minimal geodesics was studied in a paper [Kli71] of W. Klingenberg, and some of our results appear in [Kli71]. However, [Kli71] contains errors and the results which we prove here, in particular the existence of unstable geodesics, remained open. Our work will be independent of [Kli71].
- It is easy to see (cf. Lemma 3.10) that the unique geodesic in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ in Corollary 1.3 is forward (and backward) unstable.

Definition 1.6. *For $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}, \xi \in S^1$ define the* (forward) width *of γ, ξ, respectively by*

$$w(\gamma) := \liminf_{t\to\infty} d_h(c^0_\gamma(\mathbb{R}), c^1_\gamma(t)),$$
$$w(\xi) := \sup\{w(\gamma) : \gamma \in \mathcal{G}_+(\xi)\}.$$

Remark 1.7. Due to the Morse Lemma (cf. Theorem 2.4), $w(\xi)$ is bounded by the global constant $D < \infty$. As we will see, $w(\xi) = 0$ implies that all minimal rays in $\mathcal{R}_+(\xi)$ are forward unstable and in particular that the set $L(\xi)$ in Theorem 1.2 is a lamination of X, while $w(\gamma) = 0$ implies the forward instability of all minimal geodesics in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$. Moreover, $w(\xi) = 0$ implies a uniqueness result for weak KAM solutions and Busemann functions. Hence, the main task in this paper is to show $w(\xi) = 0$ for directions $\xi \in S^1$, which are not fixed by elements of Γ.

While Theorem 1.2 and its corollary did not depend on Γ, the following results rely strongly on the Γ-action. Assuming a certain behavior of a background geodesic $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$ under Γ, we can calculate $w(\xi)$.

Theorem 1.8 (Dense directions)**.** *If $\mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$ contains a hyperbolic geodesic, which has a dense forward orbit in the hyperbolic unit tangent bundle of $M = X/\Gamma$, then $w(\xi) = 0$. In particular, for almost all $\xi \in S^1$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure, we have $w(\xi) = 0$.*

Note that Theorem 1.8 has the following analogue for the case where M is the 2-torus $\mathbb{R}^2/\mathbb{Z}^2$ (cf. [Ban94] for the Riemannian, [Sch14] for the Finsler case): For all irrational rotation directions (which have full Lebesgue measure in S^1), the set of minimal geodesics with this direction is a lamination of the universal cover $\mathbb{R}^2$ and the weak KAM solutions with irrational directions are unique up to adding constants.

For completeness and to exemplify the concept of width, we state the following proposition, which follows directly from the results of Morse.

Proposition 1.9 (Periodic directions)**.** *If $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$ is an axis of a non-trivial group element $\tau \in \Gamma$ (i.e. $\tau\gamma = \gamma$), then*

$$w(\gamma) = w(\gamma(\infty)) = \inf_{t\in\mathbb{R}} d_h(c^0_\gamma(\mathbb{R}), c^1_\gamma(t)),$$
$$w(\gamma') = 0 \qquad \forall \gamma' \in \mathcal{G}_+(\xi) - \{\gamma\}.$$

In particular, $w(\gamma(\infty)) = 0$ if and only if there is only one geodesic in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$.

A direct generalization of periodicity is recurrence; we say that $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$ is forward recurrent, if the projection of $\dot\gamma$ has a forward recurrent orbit in the hyperbolic unit tangent bundle of $M = X/\Gamma$. For the case $w(\xi) = 0$ the structure of $\mathcal{R}_+(\xi)$ was explained in Remark 1.7 above. If $w(\xi) > 0$, we have the following results.

Theorem 1.10 (Recurrent directions)**.** *Let $\xi \in S^1$ and $w(\xi) > 0$.*

1. *There are at most two forward recurrent geodesics in $\mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$,*
2. *If $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$ is forward recurrent, then $w(\gamma) = w(\xi)$ and there is a forward unstable geodesic in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$,*
3. *If ξ satisfies the conclusion of Theorem 1.2 (i.e. if the set of bounding geodesics $L(\xi)$ with direction ξ is a lamination of X), then there can be at most one forward recurrent direction in $\mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$ and if there is a forward recurrent direction $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$, then*

$$w(\gamma) = w(\gamma(\infty)) = \inf_{t\in\mathbb{R}} d_h(c^0_\gamma(\mathbb{R}), c^1_\gamma(t)),$$
$$w(\gamma') = 0 \qquad \forall \gamma' \in \mathcal{G}_+(\xi) - \{\gamma\}.$$

Corollary 1.11. *If $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$ is forward recurrent, then there exists forward unstable minimal geodesic in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$.*

Proof. If $w(\gamma(\infty)) = 0$, then all minimal geodesics in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ are forward unstable by Proposition 4.3. If $w(\gamma(\infty)) > 0$, then the claim follows from Theorem 1.10 (2). □

In Mather theory, one studies minimal geodesics $c : \mathbb{R} \to M$ (more generally: action minimizers of Lagrangian systems), such that $\dot c : \mathbb{R} \to SM$ is a graph over its projection in M. This means that in the universal cover, the curves $\tau c(\mathbb{R})$ and $c(\mathbb{R})$ are equal or disjoint for all $\tau \in \Gamma$, and c is called *simple*. Note that, if a minimal geodesic c in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ is simple, then so is its background geodesic γ. In this case we have the following result.

Theorem 1.12 (Simple directions)**.** *If $\mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$ contains a simple hyperbolic geodesic, which is not the axis of any $\tau \in \Gamma - \{\mathrm{id}\}$, then $w(\xi) = 0$.*

It is not clear to us whether the conclusion of Theorem 1.2 is true for all $\xi \in S^1$. If it would hold, then this would clarify the structure of all $\mathcal{R}_+(\xi)$, as seen in the following theorem.

Theorem 1.13. *If F is such that for all $\xi \in S^1$ the set of bounding geodesics $L(\xi)$ with direction ξ defined in Theorem 1.2 is a lamination of X, then $w(\xi) = 0$ for all $\xi \in S^1$ that are not fixed under any $\tau \in \Gamma - \{\mathrm{id}\}$.*

Remark 1.14. The set $L(\xi)$ is a lamination of X for all $\xi \in S^1$, e.g., if F has no conjugate points, cf. Theorem 12.1 in [HM42]. In particular, if F is Riemannian with non-positive curvature, then the only flat strips of uniformly positive width are periodic. By Theorem 1.2, this assumption of Theorem 1.13 is always "almost" true.

Remark 1.15. The main concepts in this paper work in any dimension, in particular the weak KAM theory for manifolds of hyperbolic type developed in Section 3 and the concept of width in Section 4. E.g., if in a closed manifold M carrying a Riemanniam metric g_h of strictly negative curvature there exists a hyperbolic geodesic γ with respect to g_h, such that in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ there is only one minimal geodesic, then $w(\xi) = 0$ for almost all ξ in the so-called Gromov boundary (with respect to the Lebesgue measure, identifying the Gromov boundary with a sphere $S^{\dim M}$) , cf. the arguments for the proof of Theorem 1.8. Here $w(\xi)$ has to be defined differently, for instance by setting

$$w(\xi) = \sup\big\{ \liminf_{t\to\infty} d_h(c_v(\mathbb{R}), c_w(t)) : v, w \in \mathcal{R}_+(\xi)\big\}.$$

Most results, however, are strongest in dimension two, hence we stick to this case to simplicity the exposition.

Structure of this paper In Section 2, we recall basic definitions and properties as well as the Morse Lemma. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.2; here we study so-called weak KAM solutions, which are used to prove Theorem 1.2 and its corollary. In Section 4, the concept of width of asymptotic directions is introduced to obtain Theorems 1.8, 1.9, 1.10, 1.12 and 1.13. In Appendix A, we make additional remarks on weak KAM solutions in dimension two; the results of the appendix are, however, not used in this paper.

2. Finsler metrics and minimal rays

We write $\pi : TX \to X$ for the canonical projection, 0_X denotes the zero section and $T_xX = \pi^{-1}(x)$ the fibers.

Definition 2.1. *A function $F : TX \to \mathbb{R}$ is a* Finsler metric on X*, if the following conditions are satisfied:*

1. *(smoothness) F is C^∞ off 0_X,*
2. *(positive homogeneity) $F(\lambda v) = \lambda F(v)$ for all $v \in TX, \lambda \geq 0$,*
3. *(strict convexity) the fiberwise Hessian* $\mathrm{Hess}(F^2|_{T_xX})$ *of the square F^2 is positive definite off 0_X for all $x \in X$.*

We say that F is uniformly equivalent *to g_h, if*

$$\exists c_F > 0 : \quad \frac{1}{c_F} \cdot F \leq \|.\|_h \leq c_F \cdot F.$$

We say that F is invariant under $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{Iso}(X, g_h)$*, the group of deck transformations Γ with respect to the covering $X \to M$, if*

$$F(d\tau(\pi v)v) = F(v) \quad \forall v \in TX, \tau \in \Gamma.$$

Note that uniform equivalence of F, g_h is implied by invariance under Γ due to compactness of M. For the rest of this paper, we fix the Finsler metric F on X, which is assumed to be uniformly equivalent to g_h.

Write $SX = \{v \in SX : F(v) = 1\}$ for the unit tangent bundle of F. The *geodesic flow* $\phi_F^t : SX \to SX$ of F is given by $\phi_F^t v = \dot{c}_v(t)$, where $c_v : \mathbb{R} \to X$ is the F-geodesic defined by $\dot{c}_v(0) = v$. We write $l_F(c) = \int_a^b F(\dot{c})dt$ for the F-length of absolutely continuous (C^{ac}) curves $c : [a, b] \to X$ and

$$d_F(x, y) = \inf\{l_F(c) \mid c : [0, 1] \to X \ C^{ac},\ c(0) = x, c(1) = y\}$$

for the F-distance. Note that if F is not reversible, i.e. if not $F(\lambda v) = |\lambda|F(v)$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $d_F(x, y) \neq d_F(y, x)$ in general.

Definition 2.2. *A C^{ac} curve segment $c : [a, b] \to X$ with $F(\dot{c}) = 1$ a.e. is said to be* minimal*, if $l_F(c) = d_F(c(a), c(b))$. Curves $c : [0, \infty) \to X$, $c : (-\infty, 0] \to X$, $c : \mathbb{R} \to X$ are called* forward rays, backward rays, minimal geodesics*, respectively, if each restriction $c|_{[a,b]}$ is a minimal segment. Set*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_- &:= \{v \in SX : c_v : (-\infty, 0] \to X \text{ is a backward ray}\},\\
\mathcal{R}_+ &:= \{v \in SX : c_v : [0, \infty) \to X \text{ is a forward ray}\},\\
\mathcal{M} &:= \{v \in SX : c_v : \mathbb{R} \to X \text{ is a minimal geodesic}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We will in this paper mainly be concerned with forward rays, the results for backward rays being completely analogous.

The following lemma is a key property of rays. It excludes in particular successive intersections of rays and shows that asymptotic rays can cross only in a common initial point. The idea of the proof is classical; it can be found in [Sch14], Lemma 2.21.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $v_n, v, w \in \mathcal{R}_+$ with $v_n \to v$. Assume that $\pi w = c_v(a)$ for some $a > 0$, but $w \neq \dot{c}_v(a)$. Then, for all $\delta > 0$ and sufficiently large n,*

$$\inf\{d_h(c_{v_n}(s), c_w(t)) : s \in [a, \infty), t \in [\delta, \infty)\} > 0.$$

2.1. **The Morse Lemma and asymptotic directions.** The following theorem, due to H. M. Morse, is the cornerstone of our investigation and arises from the uniform equivalence of F and the negatively curved g_h. The fact that the Morse Lemma also holds in the Finsler case was first observed by E. M. Zaustinsky [Zau62]. Due to Klingenberg [Kli71], the Morse Lemma holds in any dimension.

Theorem 2.4 (Morse Lemma, cf. [Mor24])**.** *Let F, g_h be uniformly equivalent. Then there exists a constant $D \geq 0$ depending only on F, g_h with the following property. For any two points $x, y \in X$, the hyperbolic geodesic segment $\gamma : [0, d_h(x, y)] \to X$ from x to y and any minimal segment*

$c : [0, d_F(x, y)] \to X$ from x to y we have

$$\max_{t\in[0,d_F(x,y)]} d_h(\gamma[0, d_h(x, y)], c(t)) \leq D.$$

If $c : [0, \infty) \to X$ is a forward ray, then there exists a hyperbolic ray $\gamma : [0, \infty) \to X$, and conversely, if $\gamma : [0, \infty) \to X$ is a hyperbolic ray, then there exists a forward ray $c : [0, \infty) \to X$, such that

$$\sup_{t\in[0,\infty)} d_h(\gamma[0, \infty), c(t)) \leq D.$$

The analogous statements hold for backward rays and minimal geodesics.

With the Morse Lemma we can associate asymptotic directions to rays. Namely, if $c : [0, \infty) \to X$ is a ray, choose any hyperbolic ray $\gamma : [0, \infty) \to X$, such that $\sup_{t\in[0,\infty)} d_h(\gamma[0, \infty), c(t)) < \infty$ and write $c(\infty) := \gamma(\infty) \in S^1$. Note that $c(\infty) = \xi \in S^1$ if and only if $c(t) \to \xi$ in the euclidean sense in $\mathbb{C} \supset X$. Recall that $\mathcal{G}$ is the set of oriented, unparametrized hyperbolic geodesics $\gamma \subset X$ and that $\mathcal{R}_\pm, \mathcal{M}$ are the sets of initial vectors of forward and backward rays and minimal geodesics, respectively.

Definition 2.5. *For $\xi \in S^1, \gamma \in \mathcal{G}$ we set*

$$\mathcal{R}_\pm(\xi) := \{v \in \mathcal{R}_\pm : c_v(\pm\infty) = \xi\},$$
$$\mathcal{M}(\gamma) := \{v \in \mathcal{M} : c_v(-\infty) = \gamma(-\infty) \text{ and } c_v(\infty) = \gamma(\infty)\}.$$

Remark 2.6. Due to the Morse Lemma we have

$$\mathcal{R}_\pm = \bigcup_{\xi\in S^1} \mathcal{R}_\pm(\xi), \quad \mathcal{M} = \bigcup_{\gamma\in\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{M}(\gamma).$$

The following lemma shows that the usual topology of S^1 is connected with the topology in SX. Recall that we identified X with the interior of the unit disc in $\mathbb{C}$. For the closure $\bar{X} = X \cup S^1$ we take the usual topology induced by $\mathbb{C}$.

Lemma 2.7. *If $v_n, v \in \mathcal{R}_+$ with $v_n \to v$, then $c_{v_n}(\infty) \to c_v(\infty)$ in S^1.*

Proof. Let $\gamma_n, \gamma \in \mathcal{G}$ be the hyperbolic geodesics connecting $\pi v_n, \pi v$ to $c_{v_n}(\infty), c_v(\infty)$, respectively. The Morse Lemma shows that for large n the hyperbolic geodesics γ_n, γ stay at bounded d_h-distance on long subsegments, their length increasing to ∞ with n. In the limit, by $\pi v_n \to \pi v$, we obtain a hyperbolic limit geodesic initiating from πv, with bounded distance from $c_v[0, \infty)$ and hence from γ. By the uniqueness of such γ, we obtain $\gamma_n \to \gamma$ with respect to the euclidean Hausdorff distance in $\mathbb{C}$ and in particular their endpoints converge in S^1. □

3. Weak KAM solutions

We continue to assume that F, g_h are uniformly equivalent. For the proof of Theorem 1.2, we will use certain functions, that have been studied in various situations throughout the literature; in particular, they arise as Busemann functions, as we shall see below. We use the language of A. Fathi's weak KAM theory (cf. [Fat08] for an introduction).

Definition 3.1. *A function $u : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is called a* forward weak KAM solution of direction $\xi \in S^1$, *written $u \in \mathcal{H}_+(\xi)$, if the following two conditions hold:*

(1) $u(y) - u(x) \leq d_F(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in X$,
(2) for all $x \in X$ there exists a forward ray $c : [0, \infty) \to X$ with $c(0) = x$, $c(\infty) = \xi$, $F(\dot{c}) = 1$ and $u(c(t)) - u(x) = t$ for all $t \in [0, \infty)$.

*We write $\mathcal{J}_+(u)$ for the set of all $v \in SX$, such that $u(c_v(t)) - u(\pi v) = t$ for all $t \geq 0$, call the ray $c_v : [0, \infty) \to X$ u-*calibrated *and set*

$$\mathcal{J}(u) := \bigcap_{t \geq 0} \phi_F^t \mathcal{J}_+(u).$$

The set of all forward weak KAM solutions is denoted by

$$\mathcal{H}_+ := \bigcup_{\xi \in S^1} \mathcal{H}_+(\xi).$$

We write

$$\omega : \mathcal{H}_+ \to S^1, \quad \omega(u) = \xi \ :\iff \ \mathcal{J}_+(u) \subset \mathcal{R}_+(\xi)$$

and call $\omega(u)$ the asymptotic direction *of $u \in \mathcal{H}_+$.*

The set of backward weak KAM solutions $\mathcal{H}_-$ is defined analogously, with analogous sets $\mathcal{J}_-(u)$ and $\mathcal{J}(u) = \cap_{t \leq 0} \phi_F^t \mathcal{J}_-(u)$ for $u \in \mathcal{H}_-$ and the asymptoptic direction

$$\alpha : \mathcal{H}_- \to S^1, \quad \alpha(u) = \xi \ :\iff \ \mathcal{J}_-(u) \subset \mathcal{R}_-(\xi).$$

We will show in Lemma 3.3, that $\omega : \mathcal{H}_+ \to S^1$ is well-defined. Note that it follows from the definition (condition (1)) that $\mathcal{J}_+(u) \subset \mathcal{R}_+$ and $\mathcal{J}(u) \subset \mathcal{M}$ for all $u \in \mathcal{H}_+$.

The following lemma is well-known in weak KAM theory and probably also in the theory of Busemann functions. If $u : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable in $x \in X$, write

$$\operatorname{grad}_F u(x) := \mathcal{L}_F^{-1}(du(x)), \quad \text{where } \mathcal{L}_F(v) = \frac{1}{2} d_v F^2(v) \in T^*_{\pi v} X \subset T^* X.$$

Here d_v denotes differentiation along the fiber, $\mathcal{L}_F : TX \to T^*X$ is the Legendre transform associated to F. Note that if F is Riemannian, then $\operatorname{grad}_F u$ is the usual gradient.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $u \in \mathcal{H}_+$. Then for all $t > 0$, u is differentiable in $\pi\phi_F^t\mathcal{J}_+(u)$. If u is differentiable in $x \in X$, then*

$$\mathcal{J}_+(u) \cap T_xX = \{\mathrm{grad}_F\, u(x)\}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{J}_+(u)$ is forward-invariant by the geodesic flow ϕ_F^t and that by Lemma 3.2 the set $\phi_F^\varepsilon\mathcal{J}_+(u)$ for $\varepsilon > 0$ is a graph over the zero section 0_X (it is even locally Lipschitz by Theorem 4.11.5 in [Fat08]). We will refer to this fact as the *graph property* of $\mathcal{J}_+(u)$.

Proof. Define the Lagrangian $L = \frac{1}{2}(F^2+1)$, then L is a Tonelli Lagrangian (the fact that it is only C^1 in 0_X does not matter in this situation). Write $A_L(c) = \int L(\dot c)dt$ for the action and consider Mañé's potential

$$\Phi_L(x,y) := \inf\left\{A_L(c) : T > 0, c : [0,T] \to X \ C^{ac}, c(0) = x, c(T) = y\right\}.$$

We claim that $\Phi_L = d_F$. This shows that u is dominated by L in the sense of Fathi [Fat08], such that the lemma is just a reformulation of Theorem 4.3.8 in [Fat08].

Proof of the claim: Observe that the action of any closed curve in X with respect to $L - 1/2$ is non-negative and, using Proposition 5.11 in [Sor10], one finds for each $x, y \in X$ a time $T > 0$ and a C^{ac} curve $c : [0,T] \to X$ with $c(0) = x, c(T) = y$, such that $A_L(c) = \Phi_L(x,y)$. The energy function of $F^2/2$ is just $F^2/2$ itself and c is also critical for the action with respect to $F^2/2$ when fixing the connection time, hence we obtain $F^2(\dot c) = \text{const.}$. Consider for $s > 0$ the reparametrizations $c_s : [0, T/s] \to X$, $c_s(t) = c(st)$. By minimality of $c = c_1$ under all c_s and homogeneity of F, one easily shows

$$A_L(c_s) = T/2 \cdot (sF^2(\dot c) + 1/s), \quad 0 = \frac{d}{ds}\Big|_{s=1} \frac{2}{T}A_L(c_s) = F^2(\dot c) - 1,$$

and hence $F(\dot c) = 1$. Thus, by minimality of c with respect to A_L

$$d_F(x,y) \le l_F(c) = \int_0^T 1dt = \int_0^T L(\dot c)dt = \Phi_L(x,y).$$

On the other hand, if $c : [0, d_F(x,y)] \to X$ is a minimal geodesic segment from x to y with $F(\dot c) = 1$, we obtain the other inquality:

$$d_F(x,y) = l_F(c) = \int_0^{d_F(x,y)} 1dt = \int_0^{d_F(x,y)} L(\dot c)dt \ge \Phi_L(x,y).$$

□

Lemma 3.3. *If $u \in \mathcal{H}_+(\xi)$, then $\mathcal{J}_+(u) \subset \mathcal{R}_+(\xi)$.*

Proof. Let $v \in \mathcal{J}_+(u)$ and $t > 0$. By definition, there exists a minimal ray $c : [0,\infty) \to X$ with $\dot c \in \mathcal{J}_+(u)$ and $c(0) = c_v(t), c(\infty) = \xi$. By Lemma 3.2 we find $\dot c(0) = \dot c_v(t)$, i.e. also $c_v(\infty) = c(\infty) = \xi$. □

We have the following corollary to Lemma 3.2.

Corollary 3.4. *If $u, u' \in \mathcal{H}_+$ with $\mathcal{J}_+(u) = \mathcal{J}_+(u')$, then $u - u'$ is constant.*

Proof. Let $U \subset X$ be the set where both u, u' are differentiable. U has full measure by Rademacher's Theorem (weak KAM solutions are Lipschitz by definition). Lemma 3.2 and $\mathcal{J}_+(u) = \mathcal{J}_+(u')$ show $du(x) = du'(x)$ for all $x \in U$. The claim follows. □

We now show $\mathcal{H}_+ \neq \emptyset$. There is a classical way to construct weak KAM solutions by considering so-called Busemann functions or horofunctions. For this, let $x_0 \in X$ and $x_n \in X$ be a sequence with $d_h(x_0, x_n) \to \infty$. Any C^0_{loc} limit $u \in C^0(X)$ of the sequence of functions

$$x \mapsto d_F(x_0, x_n) - d_F(x, x_n)$$

is called a horofunction. If $v \in \mathcal{R}_+$ and $x_n = c_v(n)$, then u is called the Busemann function of c_v.

Lemma 3.5. *If $x_0, x_n \in X$ with $d_h(x_0, x_n) \to \infty$, then for the sequence of functions $d_F(x_0, x_n) - d_F(., x_n) : X \to \mathbb{R}$ there exist C^0_{loc} limit functions $u \in C^0(X)$. Moreover, any limit u belongs to $\mathcal{H}_+$.*

In particular, associating the Busemann function $u_v \in \mathcal{H}$ to $v \in \mathcal{R}^+$ shows

$$\mathcal{R}_+(\xi) = \bigcup_{u \in \mathcal{H}_+(\xi)} \mathcal{J}_+(u).$$

Proof. There exists a constant c_F, such that $\frac{1}{c_F} d_F \leq d_h \leq c_F \cdot d_F$ due to uniform equivalence of F, g_h by assumption. Let $u_n := d_F(x_0, x_n) - d_F(., x_n)$, then by the triangle inequality

$$u_n(x) - u_n(y) = d_F(y, x_n) - d_F(x, x_n) \leq d_F(y, x) \leq c_F \cdot d_h(x, y)$$

and by symmetry of d_h, the functions u_n are Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant c_F. Using $u_n(x_0) = 0$ for all n, the Arzela-Ascoli Theorem shows that the u_n have a C^0_{loc} convergent subsequence with limit in $C^0(X)$. After passing to a subsequence, we now assume $u = \lim u_n$. We then obtain for $x, y \in X$ as before

$$u(y) - u(x) = \lim u_n(y) - u_n(x) \leq d_F(x, y).$$

Now let $x \in X$ and $c_n : [0, d_F(x, x_n)] \to X$ be a minimal segment from x to x_n with $F(\dot{c}_n) = 1$. Choose a convergent subsequence of $\dot{c}_n(0)$ with limit v, then $c_v : [0, \infty) \to X$ is a minimal ray. Similarly, let c^0_n connect x_0 to x_n with $\dot{c}_n(0) \to v_0$. All c_n, c^0_n and hence the limits c_v, c_{v_0} have uniformly bounded distance by the Morse Lemma. Setting $\xi := c_{v_0}(\infty)$, we have $c_v(\infty) = c_{v_0}(\infty) = \xi$ for all so obtained v. We have to show $u(c_v(t)) - u(x) = t$ for $t \geq 0$. The triangle inequality for d_F and $c_n(t) \to c_v(t)$ for $n \to \infty$ show $d_F(c_n(t), x_n) - d_F(c_v(t), x_n) \to 0$. Hence, using minimality of c_n, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & u(c_v(t)) - u(x) = \lim u_n(c_v(t)) - u_n(x) = \lim d_F(x, x_n) - d_F(c_v(t), x_n) \\ = \; & \lim d_F(x, x_n) - d_F(c_v(t), x_n) + d_F(c_n(t), x_n) - d_F(c_n(t), x_n) \\ = \; & \lim d_F(x, x_n) - (d_F(x, x_n) - t) = t. \end{aligned}$$

□

So far, everything in this section works for manifolds of hyperbolic type (i.e. possessing a metric g_h of negative curvature) in any dimension. For the next proposition, we need $\dim M = 2$. Recall the definition of the bounding geodesics c^0_γ, c^1_γ of $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ in Lemma 1.1. In each $\mathcal{J}(u)$ there are similar bounding geodesics.

Proposition 3.6. *Given $u \in \mathcal{H}_+$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_+(\omega(u))$, there exist two particular non-intersecting, minimal geodesics $c^0_{\gamma,u}, c^1_{\gamma,u}$ in $\mathcal{J}(u) \cap \mathcal{M}(\gamma)$, such that all minimal geodesics in $\mathcal{J}(u) \cap \mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ lie between $c^0_{\gamma,u}, c^1_{\gamma,u}$. Moreover, for any $x \in X$, there exists a unique $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_+(\omega(u))$, such that x lies between $c^0_{\gamma,u}, c^1_{\gamma,u}$.*

Proof. We first show that for each $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_+(\omega(u))$, there is at least one geodesic in $\mathcal{J}(u) \cap \mathcal{M}(\gamma)$. For this, we take $x_n = \gamma(-n)$ and a ray $c_n : [0, \infty) \to X$ in $\mathcal{J}_+(u)$ initiating from x_n. Each c_n has bounded distance from γ, independently of n, by the Morse Lemma. With $n \to \infty$, we obtain as a limit a minimal geodesic in $\mathcal{J}(u) \cap \mathcal{M}(\gamma)$. By the closedness of $\pi(\mathcal{J}(u) \cap \mathcal{M}(\gamma))$ and the graph property of $\mathcal{J}(u)$, there are rightmost and leftmost geodesics $c^0_{\gamma,u}, c^1_{\gamma,u}$ in $\mathcal{J}(u) \cap \mathcal{M}(\gamma)$; the first claim follows.

Now let $x \in X$ and assume that $x \notin \pi\mathcal{J}(u)$. Then there are two minimal geodesics c_0, c_1 in $\mathcal{J}(u)$ lying closest to x on either side by the closedness of $\pi\mathcal{J}(u)$. We have to show that $c_0(-\infty) = c_1(-\infty)$ and assume the contrary. Choose then a hyperbolic geodesic $\gamma' \in \mathcal{G}_+(\omega(u))$ with $\gamma'(-\infty)$ in the open segment $\sigma \subset S^1$ between $c_i(-\infty)$, such that $\omega(u) \notin \sigma$. There exists $v' \in \mathcal{J}(u) \cap \mathcal{M}(\gamma')$, such that $c_{v'}, c_0, c_1$ cannot intersect and $c_{v'}$ lies between c_0, c_1, contradicting the assumption that c_0, c_1 are closest to x. □

3.1. **Unstable geodesics.** We repeat the definition of instability.

Definition 3.7. *A forward ray $c : [0, \infty) \to X$ is called* forward unstable*, if for all minimal rays $c' : [0, \infty) \to X$ with $c'(0) \in c(0, \infty)$ and $c'(\infty) = c(\infty)$ we have $c'[0, \infty) \subset c(0, \infty)$, i.e. c' is a subray of c.*

Backward instability of backward rays $c : (-\infty, 0] \to X$ is defined analogously. A minimal geodesic is called unstable*, if it is both forward and backward unstable.*

Instability can be characterized by weak KAM solutions.

Proposition 3.8. *For $v \in \mathcal{R}_+(\xi)$, the minimal ray $c_v : [0, \infty) \to X$ is forward unstable if and only if*

$$v \in \mathcal{A}_+(\xi) := \bigcap_{u \in \mathcal{H}_+(\xi)} \mathcal{J}_+(u).$$

In particular, the set of forward unstable rays $\mathcal{A}_+(\xi) \subset \mathcal{R}_+(\xi)$ is closed.

Remark 3.9. A similar set $\mathcal{A}_+(\xi)$ appears in the setting of A. Fathi's weak KAM theory. We called it the *forward Aubry set of direction ξ*. It is not

clear to us, whether $\mathcal{A}_+(\xi) \neq \emptyset$ for all ξ. We do not expect any kind of continuity of $\xi \mapsto \mathcal{A}_+(\xi)$.

Proof. Let $v \in \mathcal{R}_+(\xi)$ be forward unstable, $t > 0$ and $u \in \mathcal{H}_+(\xi)$. For $x = c_v(t)$, we find a ray $c : [0, \infty) \to X$ in $\mathcal{J}_+(u)$, such that $c(0) = x$. But due to $\mathcal{J}_+(u) \subset \mathcal{R}_+(\xi)$ and the instability of c_v, we have $c[0, \infty) = c_v[t, \infty)$, showing by closedness of $\mathcal{J}_+(u)$, that $v \in \mathcal{J}_+(u)$.

Conversely, let $v \in \mathcal{A}_+(\xi)$, $t > 0$ and assume that $c : [0, \infty) \to X$ is a ray in $\mathcal{R}_+(\xi)$ initiating from $c(0) = c_v(t)$. The Busemann function u of c then belongs to $\mathcal{H}_+(\xi)$, while by assumption $v \in \mathcal{J}_+(u)$. Lemma 3.2 shows differentiability of u in $c_v(t)$ and $\dot{c}(0) = \dot{c}_v(t)$, i.e. c is a subray of c_v. □

For later reference, we prove the following lemma, showing a partial instability of the bounding geodesics c^i_γ of $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ from Lemma 1.1. The lemma was basically already known to Morse.

Lemma 3.10. *If $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$ and $S \subset X$ is the closed strip between c^0_γ, c^1_γ, then any ray $c : [0, \infty) \to X$ initiating in S with $c(\infty) = \gamma(\infty)$ lies entirely in S.*

The analogous statement holds for backward rays with $c(-\infty) = \gamma(-\infty)$.

Proof. Suppose $c : [0, \infty) \to X$ is a ray with $c(0) \in c^1_\gamma$ and $c(\infty) = \gamma(\infty)$, leaving S. Consider a sequence of minimal segments c_n from $c^1_\gamma(-n)$ to $c(n)$, converging to a minimal geodesic c in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ by the Morse Lemma. But due to minimality of c^1_γ, c, it has to lie left of c^1_γ, contradicting the fact that all minimal geodesics in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ lie right of c^1_γ by definition. □

3.2. **Proof of Theorem 1.2 and its corollary.** We prove a lemma. Recall the definition of $c^i_{\gamma,u}$ in Proposition 3.6 for $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}, u \in \mathcal{H}_\pm, i \in \{0, 1\}$.

Lemma 3.11. *Let $\xi \in S^1$ and $u \in \mathcal{H}_-(\xi)$, then for all but countably many $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_-(\xi)$ we have $c^0_{\gamma,u} = c^1_{\gamma,u}$, which is then forward unstable.*

Proof. Let

$$L := \bigcup \{c^i_{\gamma,u}(\mathbb{R}) : \gamma \in \mathcal{G}_-(\xi), i = 0, 1\},$$
$$A := \{C \subset X : C \text{ connected component of } X - L\}.$$

L defines a closed lamination of X by the graph property of $\mathcal{J}_-(u)$, hence all open sets $C \in A$ are pairwise disjoint. Moreover, for any $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_-(\xi)$ with $c^0_{\gamma,u} \neq c^1_{\gamma,u}$, the strip between the $c^i_{\gamma,u}$ is an element of A. The first part of the lemma follows, as long as A is countable. But as X is the union of countably many compact sets K_n, and each K_n can contain at most countably many disjoint open sets. The claim follows.

For the forward instability of $c := c^0_{\gamma,u} = c^1_{\gamma,u}$, suppose c' is a forward ray in $\mathcal{R}_+(\gamma(\infty))$ initiating from c. The nearby $c^i_{\gamma',u}$ converge to c, as $\gamma' \in \mathcal{G}_-(\xi)$ converges to γ, while they have different points at $+\infty$. Hence c' would have to be intersected twice by a minimal geodesic, contradiction. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Take a dense sequence $\xi_n \in S^1$ and write $A_n \subset S^1$ for the set of points $\gamma(\infty)$ of $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_-(\xi_n)$ and such that $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ contains a forwards unstable minimal geodesic. Then A_n has a countable complement in S^1 by Lemma 3.11. Set

$$A := \bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} A_n,$$

which still has a countable complement in S^1. If $\xi \in A$, then for all n, there exists a forward unstable, minimal geodesic $\mathcal{M}(\gamma_n)$, where γ_n is the hyperbolic geodesic from ξ_n to ξ. If $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$ is arbitrary, choose two subsequences $\xi_m^\pm$ of ξ_n, such that $\xi_m^\pm \to \gamma(-\infty)$ with $\xi_m^- < \gamma(-\infty) < \xi_m^+$ in the counterclockwise orientation of S^1. Writing $c_m^\pm : \mathbb{R} \to X$ for the forward unstable geodesic found in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma_m^\pm)$, we find limits $c^\pm$ of $\{c_m^\pm\}$ in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$. Since the $c_m^\pm$ cannot intersect the bounding geodesics c_γ^i by instability, we have $c^- = c_\gamma^1, c^+ = c_\gamma^0$. Since $\mathcal{A}_+(\xi)$ is closed, the theorem follows. □

Proof of Corollary 1.3. Let $A^+ \subset S^1$ be the set of ξ satisfying the conclusion of Theorem 1.2, then A^+ has full Lebesgue measure, since it has a countable complement. For $\xi \in A^+$ and any $u \in \mathcal{H}_+(\xi)$, both $c_\gamma^i = c_{\gamma,u}^i$ belong to $\mathcal{J}(u)$ by construction, so we can apply Lemma 3.11, showing $c_\gamma^0 = c_\gamma^1$ for all but countably many $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$. Hence, if we write A_ξ^- for the set of points $\gamma(-\infty)$ of $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$ with $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ consisting of only one minimal geodesic, each A_ξ^- with $\xi \in A^+$ again has full Lebesgue measure in S^1. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\operatorname{vol}(\{(\xi_-,\xi_+) \in S^1 \times S^1 : \xi_+ \in A^+, \xi_- \in A_{\xi_+}^-\}) \\ =\ &\int_{A^+} \left(\int_{A_{\xi_+}^-} 1 d\xi_- \right) d\xi_+ = \int_{S^1} \left(\int_{S^1} 1 d\xi_- \right) d\xi_+ \\ =\ &\operatorname{vol}(S^1 \times S^1). \end{aligned}$$

□

4. The width of asympotic directions

For the whole Section 4, we assume that F is invariant under the group Γ of deck transformations with respect to the covering $X \to M$. Note that then F can be considered a Finsler metric on M. We concentrate of the forward behavior of forward rays, while all results have analogons for backward rays.

As we remarked earlier, the Morse Lemma is the cornerstone of this work. It allows us to define the width $w(\xi)$ of $\xi \in S^1$, which is special for surfaces of genus > 1. It does not work for the 2-torus, even though the Morse Lemma also holds in this case due to G. A. Hedlund [Hed32], but does work in closed manifolds of arbitrary dimension admitting a Riemannian metric g_h of negative curvature. Hence the finiteness of the following objects reflects once more the hyperbolic background structure of X.

Recall the definition of the bounding geodesics c_γ^i of $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ in Lemma 1.1.

Definition 4.1. *For $\xi \in S^1, \gamma \in \mathcal{G}$ set*

$$\begin{aligned} i(\gamma) &:= \inf_{t\in\mathbb{R}} d_h(c^0_\gamma(\mathbb{R}), c^1_\gamma(t)), \\ w(\gamma) &:= \liminf_{t\to\infty} d_h(c^0_\gamma(\mathbb{R}), c^1_\gamma(t)), \\ w(\xi) &:= \sup_{\gamma\in\mathcal{G}_+(\xi)} w(\gamma), \end{aligned}$$

We call $w(\gamma), w(\xi)$, the (forward) width *of γ, ξ, respectively.*

Remark 4.2. Let

$$D := \sup\{d_h(c^0_\gamma(\mathbb{R}), c^1_\gamma(t)) : \gamma \in \mathcal{G}, t \in \mathbb{R}\},$$

which is finite by the Morse Lemma. Then

$$i(\gamma) \le w(\gamma) \le w(\gamma(\infty)) \le D \quad \forall \gamma \in \mathcal{G}.$$

One can study uniqueness of weak KAM solutions using the notion of width as follows.

Proposition 4.3. *If $w(\xi) = 0$ for $\xi \in S^1$, then there is up to adding a constant only one forward weak KAM solution $u \in \mathcal{H}_+(\xi)$, i.e. for any $u \in \mathcal{H}_+(\xi)$ we have*

$$\mathcal{H}_+(\xi) = \{u + c : c \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

In particular, if $w(\xi) = 0$, then $\mathcal{A}_+(\xi) = \mathcal{R}_+(\xi)$, i.e. all rays $c : [0, \infty) \to X$ with $c(\infty) = \xi$ are forward unstable.

Proof. First observe, that all c^i_γ with $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$ are positively unstable. Namely, if $c : [0, \infty) \to X$ is a ray initiating e.g. from c^0_γ, then $c(0, \infty)$ has to lie inside the strip between c^0_γ, c^1_γ by Lemma 3.10; now $w(\gamma) = 0$ and Lemma 2.3 show that c is a subray of c^0_γ. This shows that the bounding geodesic $c^i_{\gamma,u}$ in $\mathcal{J}(u)$ for $u \in \mathcal{H}_+(\xi)$ (cf. Proposition 3.6) coincide with c^i_γ.

Let now $u, u' \in \mathcal{H}_+(\xi)$, $v \in \mathcal{J}_+(u)$, $t > 0$ and $v' \in \mathcal{J}_+(u')$ with $\pi v' = c_v(t)$. By the instability of the c^i_γ, the rays c_v and $c_{v'}$ lie in a common gap of $\mathcal{A}_+(\xi)$, and hence between a pair c^0_γ, c^1_γ for some $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$. Again $w(\gamma) = 0$ and Lemma 2.3 show that $c_{v'}$ is a subray of c_v. By closedness of $\mathcal{J}_+(u')$ we find $v \in \mathcal{J}_+(u')$, showing $\mathcal{J}_+(u) = \mathcal{J}_+(u')$ by symmetry. Corollary 3.4 shows that $u - u'$ is constant. □

The widths defined above satisfy a useful upper semi-continuity property, from which we can deduce Theorem 1.8 from the introduction. For this, we use the group action by Γ.

Definition 4.4. *We say that a sequence $\gamma_n \in \mathcal{G}$ converges to $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$, if for the pairs of endpoints $(\gamma_n(-\infty), \gamma_n(\infty)) \to (\gamma(-\infty), \gamma(\infty))$ with respect to the euclidean metric in $\mathbb{C} \supset S^1$.*

A sequence $\tau_n \in \Gamma$ is positive for $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$, *if there exists a sequence $x_n \in \gamma$ with $x_n \to \gamma(\infty) \in S^1$ (with respect to the euclidean distance in $\mathbb{C} \supset X$) and a compact set $K \subset X$, such that $\tau_n x_n \in K$ for all n.*

Intuitively, a sequence τ_n is positive for $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$, if $\tau_n\gamma$ describes the behavior of $\gamma(t)$ in the compact quotient M, as $t \to \infty$.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\gamma, \gamma' \in \mathcal{G}$ and $\tau_n \in \Gamma$ be a positive sequence for γ, such that $\tau_n\gamma \to \gamma'$. Then $w(\gamma(\infty)) \leq i(\gamma')$.*

Proof. Let $\gamma(\infty) = \xi$. As τ_n is positive for γ, any other $\gamma'' \in \mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$ will converge under the τ_n to the same γ' (γ, γ'' are asymptotic with respect to d_h, which is invariant under the isometries τ_n). Hence it is enough to show $w(\gamma) \leq i(\gamma')$. Under τ_n, the minimal geodesics c^0_γ, c^1_γ have as a limit two geodesics c^0, c^1 in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma')$ (Theorem 7 in [Mor24]), which have

$$\inf_{t\in\mathbb{R}} d(c^0(\mathbb{R}), c^1(t)) \leq \inf_{t\in\mathbb{R}} d(c^0_{\gamma'}(\mathbb{R}), c^1_{\gamma'}(t)) = i(\gamma').$$

Since τ_n is positive, the claim follows. □

Proof of Theorem 1.8. The set A of $\xi \in S^1$, such that the geodesics $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$ have a dense forward orbit in the hyperbolic unit tangent bundle of M, has full Lebesgue measure (the geodesic flow is ergodic with respect to the Lebesgue measure in the hyperbolic unit tangent bundle; Theorem 1.7 in [Wal00] shows that almost all forward orbits are dense). For $\xi \in A$, take any $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$ and a sequence $\tau_n \in \Gamma$ positive for γ, such that $\tau_n\gamma \to \gamma'$, where γ' is such that $\mathcal{M}(\gamma')$ contains only one minimal geodesic. Such γ' exist by Corollary 1.3. But then $i(\gamma') = 0$ and Lemma 4.5 proves that $w(\xi) = 0$ for all $\xi \in A$. □

Intuitively the above proof shows that, if $\xi \in S^1$ is the point at infinity of a forward dense hyperbolic geodesic, then the complicated behavior of the geodesics in $\mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$ forces all rays in $\mathcal{R}_+(\xi)$ to come close to each other at infinity. Otherwise, the hyperbolic topology of M would "peel" the geodesics away from each other, as the geodesics move around the surface.

Observe that the techniques in the proof of Theorem 1.8 work in any dimension, as long as there is one $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$ with $i(\gamma) = 0$ (cf. also Remark 1.15 in the intoduction). The existence of γ with $i(\gamma) = 0$ in general hyperbolic manifolds is, however, not clear to us.

We have two more techniques to derive $w(\gamma) = 0$, that we will use below.

Lemma 4.6. *Suppose $\gamma, \gamma' \in \mathcal{G}$ and $\tau_n \in \Gamma$ is positive for γ with $\tau_n\gamma \to \gamma'$, such that $\tau_n\gamma \cap \gamma' = \emptyset$ in X. Then $w(\gamma) = 0$.*

Proof. First assume that $\tau_n\gamma$ and γ' have no points at infinity in common for infinitely many n. The bounding geodesics c^i_γ converge (after taking a subsequence if necessary) under τ_n to one bounding geodesic, $c^0_{\gamma'}$, say (no geodesic in $\mathcal{M}(\tau_n\gamma)$ can intersect $c^0_{\gamma'}$, cf. Theorem 4 in [Mor24]). This shows that for large n, the two geodesics $\tau_n c^i_\gamma$ are close. Using that τ_n is positive for γ, the claim follows.

Now let $\tau_n\gamma(\infty) = \gamma'(\infty)$ for infinitely many n, w.l.o.g. for all n. Then we find n, m, such that $\tau := \tau_n^{-1}\tau_m$ fixes $\gamma(\infty)$. Since a periodic hyperbolic

geodesic cannot approach any other hyperbolic geodesic, γ is not the axis of τ. Theorem 4.9 below shows that c^0_γ, c^1_γ are asymptotic.

Finally, suppose $\tau_n\gamma(-\infty) = \gamma'(-\infty)$ for infinitely many n, w.l.o.g. for all n. Replace γ by $\tau_1\gamma$, such that we can assume $\xi := \gamma(-\infty) = \gamma'(-\infty)$. Now it follows that all τ_n fix ξ and there exists $\tau \in \Gamma - \{\mathrm{id}\}$, such that $\tau_n = \tau^{k_n}$ for a sequence $k_n \in \mathbb{Z}$. But for such τ_n, there cannot be a sequence $x_n \in \gamma, x_n \to \gamma(\infty)$, which is moved under τ_n into a given compact set, contradicting the assumption that τ_n is positive for γ. □

Lemma 4.7. *Let $\gamma, \gamma' \in \mathcal{G}$, $\tau_n \in \Gamma$ positive for γ and γ' be the axis of some $\tau \in \Gamma - \{\mathrm{id}\}$, such that $\tau_n\gamma \to \gamma'$ and $\tau_n\gamma \neq \gamma'$ for all n. Then $w(\gamma) = 0$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.6, we can assume that $\tau_n\gamma \cap \gamma' \neq \emptyset$ for all n. Assume that $\tau_n\gamma(\pm\infty) > \gamma'(\pm\infty)$ in the counterclockwise orientation of S^1, the other case being analogous. Then $c_n := \tau_n c^0_\gamma$ and $c^1_{\gamma'}$ have to intersect in some point $x_n = c_n(s_n) = c^1_{\gamma'}(t_n)$. Choose $k_n \in \mathbb{Z}$, such that $\tau^{k_n}x_n$ lies in a compact set and assume w.l.o.g. that $x_n \to x \in c^1_\gamma(\mathbb{R})$. The backward rays $\tau^{k_n}c_n(-\infty, s_n]$ converge w.l.o.g. to a backward ray $c : (-\infty, 0] \to X$ with $c(0) = x$ and $c(-\infty) = \gamma'(-\infty)$ by $\tau_n\gamma \to \gamma'$. By Theorem 4.9 (3) below, c is a subray of $c^1_{\gamma'}$ and hence $\tau^{k_n}c_n$ converges to $c^1_{\gamma'}$. Note that the new sequence $\tilde{\tau}_n := \tau^{k_n} \circ \tau_n$ is again positive for γ (the points x_n converge to $\gamma'(\infty)$) and under $\tilde{\tau}_n$, the geodesic c^1_γ converges to a minimal geodesic c^1 lying at finite distance left of the limit $c^1_{\gamma'}$ of the c_n. But by definition of c^1_γ being the leftmost minimal geodesic in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma')$, we also obtain $c^1 = c^1_{\gamma'}$. The claim follows. □

Remark 4.8. Assume in Lemma 4.7, that additionally $\tau_n\gamma$ and γ' do not have the same point at $+\infty$ for all but finitely many n. Then, as all geodesics in $\mathcal{G}_+(\gamma(\infty))$ converge under τ_n to the same periodic geodesic γ', the proof of Lemma 4.7, combined with Lemma 4.6, actually shows $w(\gamma(\infty)) = 0$.

If on the other hand $\tau_n\gamma$ and γ' do have the same point at $+\infty$, then $\gamma(\infty)$ is a fixed point of Γ. We will discuss this situation in the next subsection.

4.1. **Periodic directions.** The following theorem due to Morse completely clarifies the structure of $\mathcal{R}^{\pm}(\xi)$, if $\xi \in S^1$ is fixed by some non-trivial $\tau \in \Gamma$, cf. Figure 1. Recall the definition of the bounding geodesics c^i_γ of $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ in Lemma 1.1.

Theorem 4.9 (Morse [Mor24])**.** *Let $\tau \in \Gamma - \{\mathrm{id}\}$ be a prime element with hyperbolic axis $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$. Then*

1. *the set $\mathcal{M}_{per}(\gamma)$ of initial vectors to minimal geodesics in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ that are invariant under τ contains the bounding geodesics c^0_γ, c^1_γ and any minimal geodesic in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ invariant under some τ^n with $n \in \mathbb{Z} - \{0\}$ is also invariant under τ itself, hence belongs to $\mathcal{M}_{per}(\gamma)$,*
2. *any ray in $\mathcal{R}_{\pm}(\gamma(\pm\infty)) - \mathcal{M}_{per}(\gamma)$ is asymptotic to a minimal geodesic in $\mathcal{M}_{per}(\gamma)$; moreover, no geodesic in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ can be asymptotic in both its senses to a single periodic minimal geodesic in $\mathcal{M}_{per}(\gamma)$,*



FIGURE 1. The structure of $\mathcal{R}_+(\xi)$ in $X \subset \mathbb{C}$ in Theorem 4.9 for $\xi \in S^1$ being a fixed point of some $\tau \in \Gamma - \{\mathrm{id}\}$. Minimal geodesics with respect to F are depicted in black, their corresponding background geodesics in gray, "per" labels the hyperbolic axis of τ.

(3) no ray c_v with $v \in \mathcal{R}_\pm(\gamma(\pm\infty)) - \mathcal{M}_{per}(\gamma)$ has $\pi v \in \pi\mathcal{M}_{per}(\gamma)$,
(4) between any pair of neighboring minimal geodesics c_0, c_1 in the closed set $\pi\mathcal{M}_{per}(\gamma) \subset X$ (c_0 lying right of c_1 with respect to the orientation of γ), there are minimal geodesics $c_\pm$ in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$, such that $c_+(t)$ is asymptotic to c_0 for $t \to -\infty$ and asymptotic to c_1 for $t \to \infty$; c_- has the opposite behavior. Writing $\mathcal{M}_-(\gamma), \mathcal{M}_+(\gamma)$ for the sets of all initial conditions of such "heteroclinics", we have

$$\mathcal{M}(\gamma) = \mathcal{M}_{per}(\gamma) \cup \mathcal{M}_-(\gamma) \cup \mathcal{M}_+(\gamma)$$

and the two sets $\pi(\mathcal{M}_{per}(\gamma) \cup \mathcal{M}_\pm(\gamma))$ are laminations of X.

Note that Morse proved the above statements in the Riemannian setting. However, one finds that his arguments do not rely on the Riemannian character of the metric F.

Theorem 4.9 has the following corollary, which we stated as Proposition 1.9 in the introduction.

Corollary 4.10. *Let $\xi \in S^1$ be a fixed point of a group element $\tau \in \Gamma - \{\mathrm{id}\}$ and let $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$ be the hyperbolic axis of τ. Then*

(1) For the width we have

$$w(\gamma) = i(\gamma) = w(\xi),$$
$$w(\gamma') = 0 \qquad \forall \gamma' \in \mathcal{G}_+(\xi) - \{\gamma\}.$$

In particular, $w(\xi) = 0$ if and only if there is only one minimal geodesic in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$.

(2) If S is the closed strip between c^0_γ, c^1_γ, then

$$\mathcal{A}_+(\xi) = \mathcal{M}_{per}(\gamma) \bigcup \mathcal{R}_+(\xi) \cap \pi^{-1}(X - S).$$

Proof. Theorem 4.9 shows that any ray c_v with initial condition $\pi v \in X - S$ is asymptotic to the periodic bounding geodesic c^i_γ with $i = 0$ or $i = 1$ corresponding to the connected component of πv in $X - S$. (1) follows and, using $w(\gamma') = 0$, the proof of Proposition 4.3 shows that any ray c_v with $\pi v \in X - S$ is forward unstable and hence belongs to $\mathcal{A}_+(\xi)$. Theorem 4.9 (3) shows that also the periodic geodesics in $\mathcal{M}_{per}(\gamma)$ are forward unstable, i.e. $\mathcal{A}_+(\xi)$ contains the set on the right hand side. Now let $v \in \mathcal{R}_+(\xi) - \mathcal{M}_{per}(\gamma)$, such that $\pi v \in S$. Then πv lies in an open strip $S_0 \subset S$ bounded by two neighboring periodic minimal geodesics c_0, c_1 in $\mathcal{M}_{per}(\gamma)$, and there are two heteroclinic minimal geodesics c_-, c_+ between c_0, c_1 (Theorem 4.9 (4)). If $c_v(t)$ is asymptotic to c_0, say, and if $c_+(t)$ is asymptotic to c_1 as $t \to \infty$, we find $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, such that $\tau^n c_+(\mathbb{R})$ intersects $c_v(0, \infty)$. This shows that c_v is not forward unstable, hence does not belong to the Aubry set $\mathcal{A}_+(\xi)$ by Proposition 3.8. □

4.2. **Recurrent directions.** In this subsection we prove Theorem 1.10 from the introduction (cf. Theorem 4.11 and its Corollaries 4.13, 4.14). Recall that a geodesic ray $c : [0, \infty) \to X$ is forward recurrent, if there exists a sequence $\tau_n \in \Gamma$ and a sequence of times $t_n \to \infty$, such that $\tau_n c[t_n, \infty)$ converges to $c[0, \infty)$ with respect to the euclidean Hausdorff metric in $\mathbb{C}$. This definition is equivalent to the usual definition of forward recurrence of the projected geodesic in SM.

The idea behind the results of this subsection is that the structure of $\mathcal{R}_+(\xi)$, if ξ is the endpoint of a forward recurrent geodesic $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$, is very similar to the case where ξ is fixed by some $\tau \in \Gamma - \{\mathrm{id}\}$. If $w(\xi) = 0$, then $\mathcal{R}_+(\xi)$ has a simple structure by Proposition 4.3, hence we assume $w(\xi) > 0$.

For the whole subsection, fix $\xi \in S^1$ with $w(\xi) > 0$.

Theorem 4.11. *If $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$ is forward recurrent, then*

(1) there is a forward unstable geodesic in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$,
(2) $w(\gamma) = i(\gamma) = w(\xi)$.

Presently, we do not know if c^0_γ, c^1_γ are recurrent, if γ is recurrent.

Proof. Let $\tau_n \in \Gamma$ be positive for γ, such that $\tau_n \gamma \to \gamma$. By Lemma 4.5, $i(\gamma) \geq w(\xi)$. On the other hand, $i(\gamma) \leq w(\gamma) \leq w(\xi)$ by definition, so (2) follows. Moreover, the minimal geodesics $\tau_n c^i_\gamma$ have limits c_i in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ with

$$(*) \qquad \inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}} d_h(c_0(\mathbb{R}), c_1(t)) = i(\gamma)$$

($\leq i(\gamma)$ follows from $\dot{c}_i \in \mathcal{M}(\gamma)$; if the infimum would be $< i(\gamma)$, then also $w(\gamma) < i(\gamma)$). Next, we observe that w.l.o.g., γ is non-periodic and using Lemma 4.6, the approximation $\tau_n \gamma \to \gamma$ can be assumed to satisfy $\tau_n \gamma \cap \gamma \neq \emptyset$ for all n. Assume that $\tau_n \gamma(\pm\infty) > \gamma(\pm\infty)$ in the counterclockwise

orientation of S^1, the other case being analogous. If $c : [0, \infty) \to X$ is a ray initiating from $c^0_\gamma(\mathbb{R})$, it cannot lie right of c^0_γ by Lemma 3.10. Suppose c is not a subray of c^0_γ, then for $\varepsilon > 0$, $c[\varepsilon, \infty)$ has a uniformly positive distance from $c^0_\gamma(\mathbb{R})$ by Lemma 2.3. By $(*)$, there exist times $t_m \to \infty$, such that $d_h(c_0(t_m), c^0_\gamma(\mathbb{R})) \to 0$. For large enough m, we then find a point $c_0(t_m)$ and hence for large n a point $x \in \tau_n c^0_\gamma(\mathbb{R})$ in the closed strip bounded by $c^0_\gamma(\mathbb{R}), c[0, \infty)$ (using the asymptotic behavior of $\tau_n c^0_\gamma$). A contradiction is reached using Lemma 2.3, cf. Figure 2. This shows that c^0_γ is forward unstable and hence (1) holds. □



FIGURE 2. The argument for the instability of c^0_γ.

Remark 4.12. We saw in the proof of Theorem 4.11 that one bounding geodesic c^i_γ is positively unstable, say c^0_γ. Let $A \subset S^1$ be the points ξ', such that $\gamma(-\infty) < \xi' < \gamma(\infty) = \xi$ in the counterclockwise order of S^1. Then for all $\gamma' \in \mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$ with $\gamma(-\infty) \in A$ we have $w(\gamma') = 0$ and hence all forward rays initiating in the connected component X_0 of $X - c^0_\gamma(\mathbb{R})$ touching $A \subset S^1$ with endpoint ξ are forward unstable (by the arguments in the proof of Proposition 4.3).

Proof: Under a positive sequence τ_n for γ with $\tau_n \gamma \to \gamma$, both bounding geodesics $c^i_{\gamma'}$ have limits in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ right of the limit $c_0 = \lim \tau_n c^0_\gamma$ by the instability of c^0_γ. We saw in the proof of Theorem 4.11, that c_0 and c^0_γ come close to each other near $+\infty$. Also the limits of $\tau_n c^i_{\gamma'}$ both come close to c^0_γ, since $\tau_n c^0_\gamma$ and $\tau_n c^i_{\gamma'}$ do not intersect. $w(\gamma') = 0$ follows.

Corollary 4.13. *There are at most two positively recurrent hyperbolic geodesics in $\mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$.*

Proof. Suppose the contrary and let $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3 \in \mathcal{G}$ with $\gamma_i(\infty) = \xi$ all be forward recurrent, distinct and such that $\gamma_i(-\infty)$ are increasing with respect to the counterclockwise orientation of S^1. But Remark 4.12 shows that $w(\gamma') = 0$ for all γ' on one side of γ_2, contradicting $w(\gamma_1) = w(\gamma_3) = w(\xi) > 0$ in Theorem 4.11 (2). □

The next corollary shows that for all but countably many $\xi \in S^1$ with $w(\xi) > 0$, such that there is a forward recurrent $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$, the set $\mathcal{R}_+(\xi)$

has the same structure as in the case where ξ is fixed by some $\tau \in \Gamma - \{\mathrm{id}\}$, cf. Corollary 4.10 (the only difference being that there can be more forward unstable rays between c^0_γ, c^1_γ).

Corollary 4.14. *If ξ satisfies the conclusion of Theorem 1.2 (i.e. all bounding geodesics c^i_γ with $\gamma(\infty) = \xi$ are forward unstable), then there can be at most one forward recurrent direction in $\mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$ and if there is a forward recurrent direction $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$, then*

(1) for the width we have

$$w(\gamma) = i(\gamma) = w(\xi),$$
$$w(\gamma') = 0 \qquad \forall \gamma' \in \mathcal{G}_+(\xi) - \{\gamma\},$$

(2) if S is the open strip between c^0_γ, c^1_γ, then

$$\mathcal{A}_+(\xi) \supset \mathcal{R}_+(\xi) \cap \pi^{-1}(X - S).$$

Proof. We now by Corollary 4.13 that there can be at most two recurrent directions $\mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$, which both have maximal width. Arguing as in Remark 4.12 and using our assumption that the bounding geodesics of the two directions cannot intersect, the width of one of the two recurrent directions would vanish. Items (i) and (ii) follow from Theorem 4.11 and Remark 4.12. □

4.3. **Simple directions.** In this short subsection we prove Theorem 1.12, i.e. if $\xi \in S^1$ is not a fixed point of Γ and $\mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$ contains a geodesic γ, which is simple (i.e. $\gamma, \tau\gamma$ are disjoint for all $\tau \in \Gamma - \{\mathrm{id}\}$), then $w(\xi) = 0$.

Proof of Theorem 1.12. Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$ be simple and $\xi = \gamma(\infty)$, such that ξ is not fixed under any $\tau \in \Gamma - \{\mathrm{id}\}$. Choose any positive sequence $\tau_n \in \Gamma$, such that $\tau_n\gamma$ converges to some $\gamma' \in \mathcal{G}$. Since γ is simple, also γ' is simple. If γ' is the axis of some $\tau \in \Gamma - \{\mathrm{id}\}$, apply Lemma 4.7 and Remark 4.8, which shows $w(\xi) = 0$ in this case. If γ' is not an axis, there exist $\tau'_n \in \Gamma$ positive for γ', such that $\tau'_n\gamma'$ converge to some γ'' with $\tau'_n\gamma' \cap \gamma'' = \emptyset$, since γ' is simple. Apply Lemma 4.6, showing $w(\gamma') = 0$. Now apply Lemma 4.5 to obtain $w(\xi) \le i(\gamma') \le w(\gamma') = 0$. □

4.4. **Proof of Theorem 1.13.** On the 2-torus, the only directions that admit more than one weak KAM solution are the rational directions, i.e. those which have a periodic geodesic.

Question. Do we have $w(\xi) = 0$ for all $\xi \in S^1$ not being fixed under any non-trivial group element of Γ?

In this subsection we show that the answer is affirmative, if we make an additional assumption.

Assumption (A). For any $\xi \in S^1$, the union $L(\xi)$ of all bounding geodesics c^0_γ, c^1_γ with $g \in \mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$ is a lamination of X, i.e. the bounding geodesics pairwise do not intersect.

(A) is fulfilled, e.g., if F has no conjugate points (in this case all geodesics are unstable, cf. Theorem 12.1 in [HM42]) and Theorem 1.2 shows that (A) is always "almost" fulfilled.

Theorem 4.15. *If F satisfies the assumption (A), then $w(\xi) = 0$ for all $\xi \in S^1$ not being fixed under any non-trivial group element of Γ.*

The idea in the following proof is similar to an idea in Section 3 of [CS14].



FIGURE 3. The objects in the proof of Theorem 4.15.

Proof. Figure 3 depicts the following arguments. Set

$$W := \sup\{w(\gamma) : \gamma \in \mathcal{G}, \text{ such that } \gamma \text{ is not the axis of any } \tau \in \Gamma - \{\mathrm{id}\}\},$$

assume $W > 0$ and choose a small $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$ with

$$W - \varepsilon \leq w(\gamma) \leq W.$$

Let $\tau_n \in \Gamma$ be a positive sequence for γ, such that $\gamma_n := \tau_n \gamma \to \gamma'$ for some $\gamma' \in \mathcal{G}$. We may assume w.l.o.g., that $\gamma_n \cap \gamma' \neq \emptyset$ and γ' is not an axis, since otherwise $w(\gamma) = 0$ (Lemmata 4.6 and 4.7). We assume moreover that $\gamma_n(\pm\infty) > \gamma'(\pm\infty)$ for all n in the counterclockwise orientation of S^1, the other case being analogous. By Lemma 4.5, we have

$$W \geq w(\gamma') \geq i(\gamma') \geq w(\gamma) \geq W - \varepsilon.$$

There is a point of intersection x_n of the geodesics $c^1_{\gamma'}(\mathbb{R}), c^0_{\gamma_n}(\mathbb{R})$. Let $\tau'_n \in \Gamma$ be a positive sequence for γ', such that $\tau'_n \gamma' \to \gamma'' \in \mathcal{G}$ and such that $\tau'_n x_n$ converges to some $x \in X$. Let y_n be a point of intersection of $c^0_{\gamma'}(\mathbb{R}), c^0_{\gamma_n}(\mathbb{R})$, then $d_h(x_n, y_n) \to \infty$ (the limit of $c^0_{\gamma_n}$ lies left of $c^0_{\gamma'}$). For $n \to \infty$, the segment of $\tau'_n c^0_{\gamma_n}$ between $\tau'_n x_n, \tau'_n y_n$ becomes a backward ray in the strip between $\lim \tau'_n c^i_{\gamma'}$ in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma'')$ and since by the assumption (A), no minimal geodesics of different type can intersect, the limit of $\tau'_n c^0_{\gamma_n}$ also belongs to $\mathcal{M}(\gamma'')$. But now we have in the forward end of $\mathcal{M}(\gamma'')$ to strips of width $\geq W - \varepsilon$, one bounded by $\lim \tau'_n c^i_{\gamma'}$ and the other bounded by $\lim \tau'_n c^i_{\gamma_n}$, showing $w(\gamma'') \geq 2(W - \varepsilon)$ and hence γ'' is an axis. Lemma 4.7 then shows $w(\gamma') = 0$, a contradiction. □

Appendix A. Weak KAM solutions in dimension two

In this appendix we prove results about weak KAM solutions, which are special in dimension two. Even though the results are not used in the paper, the techniques might prove useful in the future. As before, we only assume that F, g_h are uniformly equivalent for the Morse Lemma to hold.

Our first lemma is true in any dimension, replacing S^1 with the so-called Gromov boundary.

Lemma A.1. *The sets $\mathcal{H}_+ \cap \{u(x_0) = 0\}$ for fixed $x_0 \in X$ are sequentially compact in the C^0_{loc} topology and if $u, u_n \in \mathcal{H}_+$ with $u_n \to u$ in C^0_{loc}, then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{J}_+(u_n) := \{v \in SX \mid \exists v_n \in \mathcal{J}_+(u_n) : v_n \to v\} = \mathcal{J}_+(u).$$

Moreover, the asymptotic direction $\omega : \mathcal{H}_+ \to S^1$ is continuous.

Proof. By $u(y) - u(x) \le d_F(x,y) \le c_F \cdot d_h(x,y)$ with c_F as in the proof of Lemma 3.5, all $u \in \mathcal{H}_+$ are equi-Lipschitz. It now follows from the Arzela-Ascoli Theorem that any sequence $u_n \in \mathcal{H}_+$ has a convergent subsequence with limit in $C^0(X)$. Assume $u_n \to u$. If $x, y \in X$, then

$$u(y) - u(x) = \lim u_n(y) - u_n(x) \le \lim d_F(x,y) = d_F(x,y).$$

Let now $v_n \in \mathcal{J}_+(u_n)$, such that $v_n \to v$ for some $v \in SX$. Then by $|u_n(x) - u_n(y)| \le c_F d_h(x,y)$ and $c_{v_n}(t) \to c_v(t)$, we have $u_n(c_v(t)) - u_n(c_{v_n}(t)) \to 0$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} & u(c_v(t)) - u(\pi v) = \lim u_n(c_v(t)) - u_n(\pi v) \\ = \ & \lim u_n(c_v(t)) - u_n(c_{v_n}(t)) + u_n(c_{v_n}(t)) - u_n(\pi v) + u_n(\pi v_n) - u_n(\pi v_n) \\ = \ & \lim u_n(c_{v_n}(t)) - u_n(\pi v_n) = t. \end{aligned}$$

Fixing $x = \pi v_n$ shows that for all x we find a ray $c_v : [0,\infty) \to X$ with $\pi v = x$, such that $u(c_v(t)) - u(x) = t$. Moreover, if we take a subsequence of u_n, such that $\omega(u_n) \to \xi$ for some $\xi \in S^1$, then Lemma 2.7 shows that $c_v(\infty) = \xi$ for any so obtained v and hence $u \in \mathcal{H}_+(\xi)$.

The same arguments show that $\lim \mathcal{J}_+(u_n) \subset \mathcal{J}_+(u)$. Conversely, if $v \in \mathcal{J}_+(u)$, let $t > 0$ and $v_n \in \mathcal{J}_+(u_n)$, such that $\pi v_n = c_v(t)$. Lemma 3.2 shows $\lim v_n = \dot{c}_v(t)$ and since $\lim \mathcal{J}_+(u_n)$ is closed, we have $v \in \lim \mathcal{J}_+(u)$, hence $\lim \mathcal{J}_+(u_n) = \mathcal{J}_+(u)$.

To show the continuity of ω, let $u_n \to u$, then $\omega(u_n) = c_{v_n}(\infty)$ for any $v_n \in \mathcal{J}_+(u_n)$ and any limit v of $\{v_n\}$ lies in $\mathcal{J}_+(u) \subset \mathcal{R}_+(\omega(u))$. Lemma 2.7 shows that $\omega(u_n) = c_{v_n}(\infty) \to c_v(\infty) = \omega(u)$. □

Due to $\dim M = 2$, we can always find special weak KAM solutions. They are linked to the bounding geodesics c^0_γ, c^1_γ of $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ from Lemma 1.1.

Proposition A.2 (Bounding weak KAM solutions)**.** *Let $x_0 \in X$. For each $\xi \in S^1$, there exist two unique $u^0_+(\xi), u^1_+(\xi) \in \mathcal{H}_+(\xi) \cap \{u(x_0) = 0\}$ with the following property: for all sequences $u_n \in \mathcal{H}_+ \cap \{u(x_0) = 0\}$ with $\omega(u_n) \to$*

ξ and $\omega(u_n) \neq \xi$, any C^0_{loc} limit lies in $\{u^0_+(\xi), u^1_+(\xi)\}$. More precisely, assuming the counterclockwise orientation of S^1, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} u_n = \begin{cases} u^0_+(\xi) & : \omega(u_n) < \xi \\ u^1_+(\xi) & : \omega(u_n) > \xi \end{cases}.$$

Analogously, for $u_n \in \mathcal{H}_-$ with $\omega(u_n) \to \xi$ we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} u_n = \begin{cases} u^1_-(\xi) & : \omega(u_n) < \xi \\ u^0_-(\xi) & : \omega(u_n) > \xi \end{cases}.$$

One can easily deduce, that for the forward Aubry set of direction ξ from Subsection 3.1 we have

$$\mathcal{A}_+(\xi) = \mathcal{J}_+(u^0_+(\xi)) \cap \mathcal{J}_+(u^1_+(\xi)).$$



FIGURE 4. The argument in the proof of Proposition A.2. Left: w starts off c_v to the left. Right: w starts off c_v to the right. The gray circles indicate the (almost) intersections that contradict Lemma 2.3.

Proof. Let $\xi_n, \xi'_n \to \xi$ and assume that in the counterclockwise orientation of S^1, we have $\xi_n, \xi'_n > \xi$. Choose any forward weak KAM solutions $u_n \in \omega^{-1}(\xi_n), u'_n \in \omega^{-1}(\xi'_n)$ vanishing in a fixed reference point $x_0 \in X$ and let $u, u' \in \mathcal{H}_+(\xi)$ be limit functions of the u_n, u'_n, respectively (after passing to a subsequence, using continuity of ω and compactness of $\mathcal{H}_+ \cap \{u(x_0) = 0\}$). We claim that $\mathcal{J}_+(u) = \mathcal{J}_+(u')$, which also shows $u = u'$ by Corollary 3.4. By symmetry, we need to show only $\mathcal{J}_+(u) \subset \mathcal{J}_+(u')$.

Let $v \in \mathcal{J}_+(u)$ and $t > 0$. We claim $\dot{c}_v(t) \in \mathcal{J}_+(u')$, which shows $v \in \mathcal{J}_+(u')$, since $t > 0$ is arbitrary and $\mathcal{J}_+(u')$ is closed. By Lemma A.1, there exist $v_n \in \mathcal{J}_+(u_n) \subset \mathcal{R}_+(\xi_n)$ with $v_n \to v$. By $\pi\mathcal{J}_+(u'_n) = X$, we find analogously $w_n \in \mathcal{J}_+(u'_n) \subset \mathcal{R}_+(\xi'_n)$ with $\pi w_n = c_v(t)$, converging to a vector $w \in \mathcal{J}_+(u')$. Using Lemma 2.3, the sketches in Figure 4 show a contradiction by considering two cases, if $w \neq \dot{c}_v(t)$. □

Remark A.3. The above proof shows: If $v, v_n \in \mathcal{R}_+$, such that $v_n \to v$ with $c_{v_n}(\infty) \neq c_v(\infty) =: \xi$, then $v \in \mathcal{J}_+(u_+^0(\xi)) \cup \mathcal{J}_+(u_+^1(\xi))$. One can think of $\mathcal{J}_+(u_+^0(\xi))$ as the set of rightmost vectors in $\mathcal{R}_+(\xi)$, $\mathcal{J}_+(u_+^1(\xi))$ as the leftmost vectors in $\mathcal{R}_+(\xi)$.

We show how $u_+^i(\xi)$ are related to the bounding geodesics in Lemma 1.1.

Proposition A.4. *If $\xi \in S^1$, $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_+(\xi)$ and $i \in \{0,1\}$, then the bounding geodesic c_γ^i is $u_-^i(\xi)$- and $u_+^i(\xi)$-calibrated.*

Proof. E.g. for $x = c_\gamma^1(t)$, consider any sequence of $v_n \in \mathcal{R}_+(\xi_n) \cap T_xX$, where $\xi_n \to \xi$, such that $\xi_n > \xi$ in the counterclockwise orientation of S^1. Proposition A.2 and Lemma A.1 show that $v := \lim v_n \in \mathcal{J}(u_+^1(\xi))$ and if $v \neq \dot{c}_\gamma^1(t)$, c_v has to lie asymptotically left of c_γ^1, which is prohibited by Lemma 3.10. □

We close by the following nice property of the bounding weak KAM solutions. Assume that F is invariant under Γ and let $p : X \to M$ be the covering map with differential $p_* : TX \to TM$. Write Ω for the non-wandering set of ϕ_F^t in $p_*\mathcal{M} \subset SM$.

Corollary A.5. *The non-wandering set Ω is contained in*

$$\bigcup_{\xi \in S^1} \bigcup_{i=0,1} p_* \mathcal{J}(u_+^i(\xi)).$$

Hence, if one is interested only in recurrent dynamics (e.g. in the supports of invariant measures), one can restrict the attention to the dynamics in the above set, which in the universal cover consists of only two ϕ_F^t-invariant graphs over 0_X for each direction $\xi \in S^1$. In another paper [KOS13], we exploited this idea to calculate the topological entropy of $\phi_F^t|_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Proof. If $v \in \Omega$, then there exist by definition $w_n \in p_*\mathcal{M}$ and $t_n \to \infty$, such that $w_n, \phi_F^{t_n} w \to v$ in SM. Lifted to X, we find $\tau_n \in \Gamma$, such that $\tilde{w}_n$ and $(\tau_n)_* \phi_F^{t_n} \tilde{w}_n$ converge to $\tilde{v}$. If the asymptotic direction $\xi := c_{\tilde{v}}(\infty)$ is a fixed point of Γ, then $\tilde{v}$ belongs to the set above by the results in Subsecction 4.1. In the other case, if ξ is not fixed by Γ, the asymptotic directions of $c_{\tilde{w}_n}$ and $c_{(\tau_n)_* \phi_F^{t_n} \tilde{w}_n}$ cannot all be equal to ξ by the presence of the non-trivial τ_n. Proposition A.2 now proves the claim. □

References

[Ban94] V. Bangert – *Geodesic rays, Busemann functions and monotone twist maps.* Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations 2.1 (1994), 49-63.

[CIPP98] G. Contreras, R. Iturriaga, G. P. Paternain, M. Paternain – *Lagrangian graphs, minimizing measures and Mañé's critical values.* Geometric and Functional Analysis 8 (1998), 788-809.

[CS14] Y. Coudéne, B. Schapira – *Generic measures for geodesic flows in non-positively curved manifolds.* arXiv:1401.5282v1 [math.DS] (2014).

[Fat08] A. Fathi – *Weak KAM theorem in Lagrangian dynamics, preliminary version number 10*. Preprint (2008), available online at `http://www.math.u-bordeaux1.fr/~pthieull/Recherche/KamFaible/publications.html`.

[HM42] G. A. Hedlund, H. M. Morse – *Manifolds without conjugate points*. Transactions of the American Mathematical Society 51 (1942), 362-386.

[Hed32] G. A. Hedlund – *Geodesics on a two-dimensional Riemannian manifold with periodic coefficients*. Annals of Mathematics 33.4 (1932), 719-739.

[Kli71] W. Klingenberg – *Geodätischer Fluß auf Mannigfaltigkeiten vom hyperbolischen Typ*. Inventiones Mathematicae 14 (1971), 63-82.

[KOS13] G. Knieper; C. Ogouyandjou; J. P. Schröder – *Topological entropy of minimal geodesics and volume growth on surfaces*. arXiv:1308.2127 [math.DG] (2013).

[Mor24] H. M. Morse – *A fundamental class of geodesics on any closed surface of genus greater than one*. Transactions of the American Mathematical Society 26.1 (1924), 25-60.

[Sch14] J. P. Schröder – *Global minimizers for Tonelli Lagrangians on the 2-torus*. Preprint (2014), available online at `http://www.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/ffm/Lehrstuehle/Lehrstuhl-X/jan.html`.

[Sor10] A. Sorrentino – *Lecture notes on Mather's theory for Lagrangian systems*. arXiv: 1011.0590 [math.DS] (2010).

[Wal00] P. Walters – *An introduction to ergodic theory*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics 79, Springer Verlag (2000).

[Zau62] E. M. Zaustinsky – *Extremals on compact E-surfaces*. Transactions of the American Mathematical Society 102.3 (1962), 433-445.

Faculty of Mathematics, Ruhr University, 44780 Bochum, Germany
E-mail address: `jan.schroeder-a57@rub.de`